

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application. Claims 1-8 and 10-11, 13-30, and 32-36 are pending in this application.

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20-21, 23-24 and 36 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1-4, 6, 14, 22, 25-30, 32 and 34 are currently amended.

C) Claims 8, 11, 16, 19, 33 and 35 are previously presented.

D) No claims are currently added.

E) Claims 9, 12, 31 are currently cancelled.

Claim 34 is objected to on the basis of an informality..

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed towards nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-19, 21-24, 26-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by “Operating Systems Concepts”, Fifth Edition by Silberschatz and Galvin (hereinafter “OSC”).

Claims 4, 12, 20, 25, 31 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over OSC in view of Official Notice.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

### **Interview with Examiner**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and her supervisor for the in person interview at the Examiner’s office on Nov 19, 2007. In particular,

1 Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for her indication that the claims, as  
2 amended above, distinguish over the cited prior art. Applicant also wishes to  
3 thank the Examiner for her indication that claims 26-30, as amended above, are  
4 now directed to statutory subject matter.

## 5 6 **Objections**

### 7 **Claim 34**

8 Claims 34 is objected to on the basis on an informality for reciting “means  
9 for permitted” rather than “means for permitting”. Applicant has amended claim  
10 34 to recite “means for permitting” as recommended by the Office, thus obviating  
11 this objection.

### 12 **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

#### 13 **Claims 4, 12, 20, 25, 31 and 36**

14 Claims 4, 12, 20, 25, 31 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
15 being unpatentable over OSC in view of Official Notice. As noted above,  
16 Applicant has submitted amendments which the Examiner has indicated  
17 differentiate these claims over the cited prior art.

18 If the rejection is repeated however, Applicant notes that in rejecting claims  
19 4, 12, 20, 25, 31 and 36 the Office alleges that it was well known in the analogous  
20 art of client-server technology at the time of this application that a personal  
21 computer, workstation, server, set top box, video game console, personal digital  
22 assistant, cellular telephone or a handheld computing device was capable of being  
23 a client. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because there is no support  
24 in the record for the conclusion that the identified features are "old and well  
25 known." In accordance with MPEP § 2144.03, the Office must cite a reference in

1 support of its position. Applicant also disputes the notion that client-server  
2 technology can be held to be analogous to the technological art recited in the  
3 claims above.

4 **Conclusion**

5 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance  
6 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's  
7 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the  
8 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the  
9 purpose of scheduling an interview.

10 Respectfully Submitted,

11  
12 Dated: 12/26/07

By: /Jim Patterson/

13 Jim Patterson  
14 Reg. No. 52,103  
Attorney for Applicant

15 LEE & HAYES PLLC  
16 Suite 500  
17 421 W. Riverside Avenue  
18 Spokane, Washington 99201  
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x247  
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979